Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting on CPT and Lorentz Symmetry (CPT'16), Indiana University, Bloomington, June 20-24, 2016

arXiv:1607.03749v1 [hep-ph] 12 Jul 2016

The Impact of Lorentz Violation on the Klein Tunneling Effect

Zhi Xiao

Indiana University Center for Spacetime Symmetries
Bloomington, IN 47405, USA

Department of Mathematics and Physics, North China Electric Power University
Beijing 102206, China

We discuss the impact of a tiny Lorentz-violating b^μ term on the one dimensional motion of a Dirac particle scattering on a rectangular barrier. We assume the experiment is performed in a particular inertial frame, where the components of b^μ are assumed constants. The results show that Lorentz-violation modification to the transmission rate depends on the observer Lorentz nature of b^μ. For a spacelike or lightlike b^μ the induced resonant frequency shift depends on the polarization, while for timelike b^μ there is essentially no modification.

1. Basic assumptions

In this report, we try to use the Standard-Model Extension [1] to explore the impact of a tiny Lorentz symmetry violation (LV) b^μ on the Klein tunneling effect. [2] The complete analysis is presented in Ref. 3. For simplicity, we assume that we are working in a particular inertial reference frame, where all the components of b^μ remain constant. The hamiltonian of the LV modified Dirac equation is

$$\hat{H}_b = \vec{\alpha}\cdot\hat{\vec{P}} + \gamma^0 m - b^0\gamma^5 + \vec{b}\cdot\vec{\Sigma} + U(Z), \tag{1}$$

where $U(Z) = V_0[\Theta(Z) - \Theta(Z-L)]$ and $\Sigma^i \equiv \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\sigma^{jk}$, with ϵ_{ijk} being a totally antisymmetric tensor with $\epsilon_{123} = 1$. Next, we will use the spacelike b^μ term as an example to show the LV impact on the Klein tunneling, which lets us get a glimpse of how the LV impact depends on the observer Lorentz nature of b^μ.

2. The impact of the LV b^μ term on Dirac tunneling

For spacelike b^μ, we can use observer Lorentz symmetry to transform it into $b^\mu = (0, \vec{b})$, and further assume $\vec{b}(\theta,\phi) = b(\sin\theta\cos\phi, \sin\theta\sin\phi, \cos\theta)$

for convenience. The static wave function can take the form

$$\Psi_R(Z,T) = e^{-iET}\Big\{[\phi_i(p)e^{ipZ} + \phi_r(p')e^{-ip'Z}]\Theta(-Z) \\ +[\phi_f(q)e^{iqZ} + \phi_g(q')e^{-iq'Z}][\Theta(Z) - \Theta(Z-L)] \\ +\phi_t(p)e^{ipZ}\Theta(Z-L)\Big\}, \tag{2}$$

where $\phi_n = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_n \\ \eta_n \end{pmatrix}$ with subscript $n = i, r, f, g, t$ respectively. According to the Dirac equation $i\dot{\Psi}_R(Z,T) = \hat{H}_b\Psi_R(Z,T)$, each ϕ_n must satisfy

$$\begin{pmatrix} m - [E - U(Z)] + \vec{b}\cdot\vec{\sigma} & \vec{\sigma}\cdot\hat{\vec{P}} \\ \vec{\sigma}\cdot\hat{\vec{P}} & [U(Z) - E] - m + \vec{b}\cdot\vec{\sigma} \end{pmatrix}\phi_n = 0. \tag{3}$$

From the lower equation of (3), we determine η_n and substitute it back into the upper equation of (3) to get the dispersion relation

$$(p^2 + m^2 - E^2)^2 - 2b^2(p^2\cos 2\theta + E^2 + m^2) + b^4 = 0. \tag{4}$$

A similar relation applies to q with the replacements $p \to q,\ E \to E - V_0$ in Eq. (4). Assume further that $\xi_n \equiv \mathcal{N}\xi_i$, where $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T}$ respectively. By using the continuity equation at points $Z = 0,\ L$, in principle we can solve for all the proportionality constants $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T}$. For example, using the method above, we can determine the transmission amplitude as

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{e^{-ipL}}{\cos[qL] - \frac{i}{2}(\frac{\mathcal{K}p}{q} + \frac{q}{\mathcal{K}p})\sin[qL]}, \tag{5}$$

where $\mathcal{K} \equiv 1 - \frac{V_0}{E+m-bs},\ s = \pm 1$, and we have used $p = p', q = q'$ since Eq. (4) is an even function of p. Next, supposing $\vec{b} = b\ \hat{e}_Z$, we get from Eq. (5) the resonant energy

$$E_{\rm Res}(n,s) = V_0 + bs + \sqrt{m^2 + (n\pi/L)^2} \tag{6}$$

when $E > V_0 + m + bs$. This is the relativistic counterpart of ordinary quantum-mechanical resonant transmission.[4] For a specific resonance number n, the resonant energy difference between states with opposite helicity is $\delta E_{\rm Res}(n) \equiv E_{\rm Res}(n,+1) - E_{\rm Res}(n,-1) = 2b$. For a specific barrier height V_0 and energy E of the incoming electron, the resonant barrier length is $L(n,s) = \frac{n\pi}{\sqrt{(E-V_0-bs)^2-m^2}}$. The resonant-length difference between opposite-helicity states with the same n is

$$\delta L(n) = L(n,+1) - L(n,-1) \simeq 2b\frac{E - V_0}{(E-V_0)^2 - m^2}L_{\rm LI}(n), \tag{7}$$

where $L_{\rm LI}(n) = \frac{n\pi}{\sqrt{(E-V_0)^2-m^2}}$ is the Lorentz-invariant resonant-barrier length. So the resonant-length difference $\delta L(n)$ increases with the barrier length L. In principle, we may use this and a precisely controllable long barrier to amplify the tiny LV b^μ effect. See Fig. 1, where we plot with an impractically large $b \propto 0.001\mathrm{m}_e$ to make the LV helicity-dependent shift of the resonant spectrum distinguishable. A complete discussion using other types of b^μ is similar; see Ref. 3.



Fig. 1. Klein tunneling rate as a function of barrier length. The solid black curve corresponds to the Lorentz-invariant (LI) tunneling rate, while the dashed gray and black curves correspond to the Lorentz-violating tunneling rate with helicity $s = +1, -1$ respectively. The length unit is $L_0 = \pi/\sqrt{(E - V_0)2 - m^2}$.

Acknowledgments

The author appreciates valuable discussions with Alan Kostelecký, Hai Huang, Ralf Lehnert, and Herb Fertig, and is grateful for IUCSS hospitality and for study-abroad funding from the Chinese Scholarship Council.

References

1. D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6760 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116002 (1998); V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 105009 (2004).
2. O. Klein, Z. Phys. **53**, 157 (1929).
3. Z. Xiao, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 125022 (2016).
4. Z. Xiao, H. Huang, and X.X. Lu, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **29**, 1550052 (2015).